UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/601,226	06/20/2003	Robert F. Burkholder	JK01507A	9184	
	7590 08/22/200 & DECKER CORPOR	EXAMINER			
701 EAST JOP	PA ROAD, TW199	FREAY, CHARLES GRANT			
TOWSON, ME	21200		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3746		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/22/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/601,226	BURKHOLDER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Charles G. Freay	3746		

	Challes G. Freay	3740	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavir eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment to the proposed function in th	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); ter form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).			·
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ll and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. Other: See Attached Sheet. 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>7/08, 7/0</u>	9 <u>8, 8/08</u>	
	/Charles G Freay/		

Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3746

The information disclosure statements filed 7/22/08, 7/23/08 and 8/6/08 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(d) because they lack a statement as specified in 37 CFR 1.97(e). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regards to the applicant's arguments against the rejection set forth under 35 USC 103 the examiner disagrees. With regards to Ushiota the applicant argues that modifying as suggested by the examiner "so that the tank and compressor are supported by the shroud, and not by each other, and not directly connected to the specialized Ushiota feet will compromise the" design of Ushiota. Firstly, the examiner notes that he did not put forth as part of the rejection that the tank and compressor are not supported by each other and not directly connected to the feet. The rejection sets forth that Ushiota discloses generically a shroud without showing how to support the compressor unit within the shroud. Furthermore, and contrary to the applicant's arguments Beckman discloses a clamshel plastic (a material which is well know to be light and durable) shroud which clearly shows and teaches supporting a compressor unit therein at least in part by a number of different walls and projections.

The examiner notes that the amendments to claims 66, 68 and 74 if separately submitted would overcome the claim objections and would be entered. Furthermore, the examiner notes that the Terminal Disclaimer of 7/22/08 has been accepted and overcomes the obviousness type double patenting rejection.

2